

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated January 20, 2010, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed. The Examiner is thanked for the allowance of Claims 42-45.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 9, 10, 16, 17, 19, 26 and 29 are hereby amended. Claims 2 and 25 are hereby canceled. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-24 and 26-56 are currently pending with claims 46-56 previously withdrawn from consideration. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Specification

The Abstract is objected to because it exceeds the 150 word limit. *Office Action* at p. 2. Applicants have amended the Abstract in accordance with MPEP § 608.01(b). Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the Abstract.

Objections to the Claims

Claims 3, 5, 16 and 29 are objected to because of informalities. *Office Action* at p. 3. Applicants have amended claims 3, 5, 16 and 29 in the manner as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to claims 3, 5, 16 and 29.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claims 2, 9-10, 20-21 and 23-24 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of base claim 1 and any intervening claims. In the interest of expedited prosecution and without prejudice to the patentability of the previously presented claims, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 2. Accordingly, allowance of claims 1 and claims 3-24 and 26-41, which depend therefrom, is respectfully requested.

Further, Applicants appreciate and thank the Examiner for indicating that claims 42-45 are allowed.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 20-21 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. *Office Action* at p. 3. Claim 25 has been canceled herein, rendering rejection of this claim moot. Claims 20 and 21 depend from independent claim 1, which has been amended herein to recite “a pulley.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1 and 29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by European Patent Application 1,386,995 to Oae et al. (hereafter, “Oae”). *Office Action* at p. 4. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. As discussed above, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include the allowable subject matter of claim 2. Accordingly, claim 1 and claims 29-32, which depend therefrom, are allowable.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oae in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030110816 to Chang (hereafter, “Chang”). *Office Action* at p. 6. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 3-5 depend from and add further features to independent claim 1, and are thus patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, discussed above.

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oae in view of Chang in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,354,115 to Zahn (hereafter, “Zahn”). *Office Action* at p. 7. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 6-8 depend from and add further features to independent claim 1, and are thus patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, discussed above.

Claims 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oae in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20030131636 to Lim (hereafter, “Lim”). *Office Action* at p. 8. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 11-17 depend from

and add further features to independent claim 1, and are thus patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, discussed above.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oae in view of Lim further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20040163428 to Kim (hereafter, “Kim”). *Office Action* at p. 10. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 18 depends from and adds further features to independent claim 1, and is thus patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, discussed above.

Claims 19 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oae in view of Kim. *Office Action* at p. 11. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 19 and 22 depend from and add further features to independent claim 1, and are thus patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, discussed above.

Claims 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oae in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,373,485 to Nelson (hereafter, “Nelson”). *Office Action* at p. 12. Claim 25 has been canceled herein, rendering rejection of this claim moot. As to the remaining claims, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 26 and 27 depend from and add further features to independent claim 1, and are thus patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, discussed above.

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oae in view U.S. Patent No. 2,734,366 to Dunn et al. (hereafter, “Dunn”). *Office Action* at p. 12. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 28 depends from and adds further features to independent claim 1, and is thus patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, discussed above.

Claims 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oae. *Office Action* at p. 13. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 33-36 depend from and add further features to independent claim 1, and are thus patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, discussed above.

Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oae in view of Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 2002315985 to Fuki et al. (hereafter, “Fukui”). *Office Action* at p. 14. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claim 37 depends from and adds further features to independent claim 1, and is thus patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, discussed above.

Claims 38-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Oae in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20030046962 Sonoda (hereafter, “Sonoda”). *Office Action* at p. 15. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Claims 38-41 depend from and add further features to independent claim 1, and are thus patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, discussed above.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: July 27, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By /Alyssa K. Sandrowitz/

Alyssa K. Sandrowitz

Registration No.: 65,401

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant